

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending; Claim 7 is amended; and no claims are newly added or canceled herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment, as the present amendment addresses a grammatical informality in Claim 7.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over Hartman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,224,166); and Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hartman in view of Alexander (U.S. Pat. No. 6,188,602).

With regard to the rejection of Claims 10-12, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 recites, in part, “a key management unit configured to carry out a key registration for reading out from an external memory a distribution key that is obtained in advance by encrypting the instruction key and a meta-level information integrally by using a public key corresponding to the secret key ....” The claimed key management unit overcomes the difficulties of the prior art, namely with respect to the protection of copyrighted software.

The outstanding Office Action alleges at page 3 that Hartman discloses the claimed instruction key and meta-level information. To support this assertion, the outstanding Office Action cites to Hartman, col. 3, lines 35-57 and col. 6, lines 1-8. However, neither of the cited portions of Hartman disclose the claimed features.

In fact, the outstanding Office Action fails to address the meta-level information recited in independent Claim 10. Because Hartman does not disclose or suggest the claimed meta-level information, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 10 patentably distinguishes

over Hartman. It is therefore respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claims 10-12 be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, that rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which Claims 2-9 depend, recites in part: “a key management unit configured ... to notify a completion of the key registration to the processor core asynchronously by interruption when the key registration is completed ....”

The outstanding Office Action acknowledges at page 5 that this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Hartman. The outstanding Office Action then relies upon the teachings of Alexander to remedy this admitted deficiency of Hartman.

It appears that the outstanding Office Action is relying upon the “reset signal” of Alexander to teach the asynchronous interruption of Claim 1. However, Alexander relates to a mechanism to commit data to a memory device with read only access, and does not disclose or suggest that the reset signal is used to notify a completion of a key registration to the processor core when the key registration is completed. Because Alexander fails to disclose or suggest this feature, Alexander does not cure the deficiency in Hartman and the outstanding Office Action has not provided a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the subject matter of Claim 1.

Consequently, as neither Hartman nor Alexander, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the features recited in independent Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding Office Action did not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Moreover, with respect to the features of Claims 2 and 3, these claims recite that the key management unit is also configured to carry out a flashing of the cache lines stored in correspondence to the specific program identifier .... The outstanding Office Action does not cite to any teachings within either Hartman or Alexander that anticipate this feature.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding Office Action has not provided a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claims 2 and 3 for reasons additional to those set forth for Claim 1, from which these claims depend.

Additionally, the applied combination of Hartman and Alexander fails to disclose or suggest the “chain information indicating chain relationships among encryption blocks” as recited in Claim 4. The applied combination of Hartman and Alexander also does not disclose or suggest the key value index of Claims 6-8. The combination of Hartman and Alexander further fails to disclose or suggest the context key of Claim 9.

Accordingly, as the outstanding Office Action has not provided a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the subject matter of Claims 1-9, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of either Alexander or Hartman to support the applied combination. Certainly, the Office Action has not cited to any motivation within the teachings of either of these references to support the applied combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Alexander with Hartman is the result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the present specification, and is improper.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

*Katherine P. Barecchia*

---

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Katherine P. Barecchia  
Registration No. 50,607